TA-47-100167-1

13 November 1967

Dear Ed:

The attached is an attempt to provide the information you may need to reach a decision on the new concept of processing film. We have tried to design around your requirements and desires, although I have some comments to make later on. Also, an attempt has been made to answer the
25X1A questions you gave [redacted] but in some instances, I think we avoided definite answers.

The points I would like to highlight are enumerated below.

By policy, I cannot quote you directly on the cost - it has to go from C.O. to C.O. However, for your information, I am reasonably sure that the 950K is a good healthy figure, and that we can stay within it if you should authorize us to proceed. Such a price, however, is not meaningful if done via AF channels. Because of all their rules and restrictions, the cost would be nearer 1400K, so don't quote the figure of 950K outside your shop.

While we have increased the two reefers from 8'x8'x8' to 8'x8'x9' in an effort to accommodate 28 B boxes, I am not in favor of the idea. For one thing, if your Detachment people were really planning on 14 missions, they would take not 28 rolls but 45 to 60 and we certainly can't handle that many in these small reefers. I think we should go back to 8'x8'x8' and make the shelter 24' long instead of the 20' as shown. It is axiomatic that the need for space will grow with experience. We can't add to the shelter in the field but we could always rotate the reefers faster than every 14 days.

Another requirement I am not enthusiastic about is the requirement to carry stateside water with us. We now think we need 50 gallons per mission and are planning to carry 300 gallons in the shelter and the balance in 50 gallon drums. But the weight in the shelter alone is 25% of its total weight. I suspect it might be more practical to get the water "locally" but, in the meantime, we are running some tests to determine if we can treat the water and reuse it (even so, we won't be able to save more than 25 gals. per mission).

We certainly can operate with the three men specified but we can't unload a 12,000 pound shelter from the aircraft nor move it without mechanical help (or lots of manpower). I assume this is a problem common to a lot of other equipment.

25X1A The one big problem we might stumble on is the gamma of the negative. I don't know where [redacted] gets their 2.14 ± 02 from unless its from thin air, but I do agree that the present Bimat chemistry provides gammas considerably lower than you are accustomed to. It was deliberately tailored this way for use with low level material. The Research Labs tell me they are optimistic about raising the gamma if there is a demand for it. The only sure way to establish a need is to have equipment that requires the new material. From past experience, I know I can't get much more than sympathy if I just "want" it, but don't have to have it.

E. L. G.

ELG:atr
Attach. - TA-47-100169-1 & 2